

REMARKS

The office action of June 12, 2006, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the abstract of the disclosure is objected to for using improper language.

Claims 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Ossendorf.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ossendorf in view of the patent to Willeke et al.

In connection with the Examiner's objections to the Abstract of the Disclosure, applicant has deleted the original abstract and attached hereto a new Abstract of the Disclosure.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on

file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to the patent to Ossendorf, it can be seen that this patent discloses a bending device for four-high or multi-roll stands. Ossendorf only uses piston-cylinder units. There is no disclosure of a vertical positioning mechanism as recited in the presently claimed invention.

The patent to Willeke et al. discloses an apparatus for roll counter-deflection in rolling stands.

The Examiner combined these references in determining that claims 1-3 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation in either reference for making the combination argued by the Examiner so as to arrive at the presently claimed invention. In the prior art, as mentioned on page 2 of the specification of the present application, "the movable support of each end necessarily results in high frictional forces, which, in addition, have negative effects on the flatness control." Willeke et al. only teach spindle lifting devices. There is no recognition by either

reference, or their combination, of the problems being addressed in the present invention. There is no suggestion in either reference of a reduction of the movable bearing in order to reduce friction. Furthermore, neither reference, nor their combination, suggests combining a piston-cylinder and a spindle-type lifting mechanism in the same device, as in the presently claimed invention. Simply because both existed separately does not indicate that it is obvious to combine them into a single device. The only suggestion for doing so is given by the present application.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Ossendorf does not disclose a piston-cylinder and a vertical positioning mechanism wherein the vertical lifting mechanism is wedges with restricted guidance, a cylinder with a clamping head and a position sensor, or an eccentric shaft, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted

**HM-618**

that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Friedrich Kueffner  
Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: September 12, 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 12, 2006.

By:



Friedrich Kueffner

Date: September 12, 2006